

09/928,247

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2007

- 5 -

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed February 7, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 35-55 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 47-54 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 35 and 42 have been amended. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Summary of Telephone Conference with Examiner

Applicant's representatives appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiner Vargot in granting and conducting the telephone conference of April 3, 2007. During the telephone conference differences between the claimed invention and the prior art were discussed.

Examiner Vargot provided suggested claim amendments. Specifically, Examiner Vargot suggested removing the word "blocking" from Claim 42 in order to be in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112. Amendments to Claim 35 were discussed, and approved by Examiner Vargot, in which the limitation in the fifth paragraph of the claim has been placed above the fourth paragraph, for the purpose of clarity.

Finally, Examiner Vargot had suggested that upon the canceling of Claims 47-54, the application will be in condition for allowance. Thus, following the suggestion given by Examiner Vargot, claims 47-57 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects Claims 35-46 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Claim 35 has been rejected from comprising the word "radiation" and for lacking sufficient antecedent basis for "the base film."

The inclusion of the word "radiation" in Claim 35 was a typographical error and has been removed. Claim 35 has also been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for "the base film." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35-46 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested. Additional amendments to Claim 35 and an amendment to 42 have been made as was suggested by Examiner Vargot (see above).

09/928,247

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 03 2007

- 6 -

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 35-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,576,850 to Martens (Martens) in view of Japanese published application no. 8-137375 (Japanese 375). This rejection was discussed during the interview with Examiner Vargot and Applicant has taken the suggestions of the Examiner (see Telephone Conference Summary).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

David J. Thibodeau, Jr.

Registration No. 31,671

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Date: 4/3/07